

REMARKS

Claims 4, 6-9, 14, 15, and 21-27 are pending in this application, of which claims 22-27 are independent. In this Amendment, claims 6, 14, 15, and 22-27 have been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in, for example, TABLE 2 and Fig. 3, and relevant description thereof in the specification.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the “wherein” clause in both claims does not have support in the original specification.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 26 to recite that “the order-of-priority information specifies order of the selected two or more two-dimensional image data” based on, for example, Fig. 3 of the present application (*see, e.g.*, viewpoint number (3, 0) (4,0) in the figure and relevant description thereof). The “wherein” clause in claim 27 has been deleted.

Applicants believe these amendments are fully responsive to the Examiner’s concerns. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takemoto et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0048354, hereafter “Takemoto”).

Takemoto does not disclose or suggest a stereoscopic image display apparatus including all the limitations recited in claim 27. Specifically, the reference does not teach, among other things, “means for selecting the specified two-dimensional images according to an order-of-

priority to be given to the selected two-dimensional images, the order-of-priority being determined by order of specifying the viewpoint-number information in the attached information,” recited in claim 27. This is so because the Examiner admitted that “Takemoto et al do not explicitly define order-of-priority information for each viewpoint” with respect to claim 22 (the second paragraph on page 6 of the Office Action).

Based on the foregoing, Takemoto does not disclose or suggest a stereoscopic image display apparatus including all the limitations recited in claim 27. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claim.

2. Claims 4, 6-9, 14, 15, and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takemoto in view of Imaizumi et al. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2000-023198, hereafter “Imaizumi”).

Takemoto and Imaizumi, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a stereoscopic vision-use image providing method including all the limitations recited in independent claims 22 and 23, and a stereoscopic image display apparatus including all the limitations recited in independent claims 24-26.

With respect to independent claim 22, the applied combination of the references does not teach, among other things, the following limitations recited in the claim:

order-of-priority information indicating an order-of-priority to be given to the selected two-dimensional images, the order-of-priority being determined by order of specifying the viewpoint-number information in the attached information; and ..., wherein

the order-of-priority information specifies order of the selected two or more two-dimensional images.

As indicated above, the Examiner admitted that “Takemoto et al do not explicitly define order-of-priority information for each viewpoint” with respect to claim 22 (the second paragraph on page 6 of the Office Action). However, the Examiner asserted that Imaizumi teaches the

missing feature of Takemoto, and concluded that it would have been obvious to modify Takemoto's method based on the teachings of Imaizumi to arrive at the claimed subject matter.

Imaizumi teaches specifying a relationship between images ("viewpoint ranking") and such ranking is sent to a receiving side together with images. However, Imaizumi does not teach arranging two-dimensional images for displaying a three-dimensional image to be perceived by a user based on the viewpoint ranking. In addition, Imaizumi does not teach format of the ranking. It appears that Imaizumi's method has specially formatted ranking data because there is viewpoint ranking memory 1 shown in Fig. 2.

Based on the above, it is apparent that Imaizumi does not teach, among other things, that "order-of-priority information indicat[es] an order-of-priority to be given to the selected two-dimensional images," and "the order-of-priority [is] determined by order of specifying the viewpoint-number information in the attached information," as recited in claim 22. These limitations are exemplarily described in the paragraph bridging pages 14-15 of the specification which is reproduced below:

In the above example, as shown in FIG. 3, information in which the viewpoint-number information as information for selecting two or more two-dimensional images are arranged in order of priority is set as the attached information within the file header. In addition, in the example shown in FIG. 3, the viewpoint-number information as the information for selecting the two-dimensional images are (3,0) and (4,0). In this case, (3,0) is written first, and (4,0) is written after that, which means that a first order of priority is given to (3,0), and a second order of priority is given to (4,0). By doing so, when providing as data the plurality of two-dimensional images of different viewpoints as stereoscopic vision-use images, attached information composed of the viewpoint-number information allotted to each two-dimensional image data, and the information formed by arranging in order of priority the viewpoint-number information as the information for selecting two or more two-dimensional images, together with two-dimensional image data, is to be provided.

Imaizumi is silent on viewpoint ranking in the above-discussed format. Accordingly, Imaizumi does not cure the deficiencies of Takemoto.

Based on the foregoing, Takemoto and Imaizumi, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a stereoscopic vision-use image providing method including all the limitations recited in independent claim 22.

The above discussion is applicable to independent claims 23-26 at least because these claims respectively include limitations similar to the above-discussed limitations of independent claim 22. Accordingly, Takemoto and Imaizumi, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a stereoscopic vision-use image providing method including all the limitations recited in independent claim 23, and a stereoscopic image display apparatus including all the limitations recited in independent claims 24-26.

Dependent claims 4, 6-9, 14, 15, and 21 are also patentably distinguishable over Takemoto and Imaizumi at least because each dependent claim includes all the limitations recited in a corresponding independent claim.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and favorable reconsideration thereof.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/553,390

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


Tomoki Tanida
Registration No. 60,453

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 TT:amz
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: April 13, 2011